DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 103 HE 024 003

AUTHOR Duronio, Margaret A.; Loessin, Bruce A.
TITLE Testing the Conventional Wisdom of Fund Raising Effectiveness in Higher Education Institutions. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Portland, OR, November 1-4, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Role; College Presidents; Donors; Entrepreneurship; *Fund Raising; Goal Orientation; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Leadership; Management Information Systems; Marketing; National Surveys; *Organizational Climate; Personnel Evaluation; *Program Design; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Reputation; Trustees
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; Institutional Image

ABSTRACT

A study of the fund raising program design aspects commonly considered important in fund raising success and the strength of these aspects in institutions with various levels of fund-raising success is reported. The 398 institutions studied include public and private research universities, public and private doctoral universities, public comprehensive universities, and public and private four-year colleges. Fund-raising data from the years 1985-86 through 1987-88 were used to determine institutional success ratings. Development officers were asked to rate the importance of each program aspect to fund-raising success and evaluate each aspect at their own institutions. Program aspects investigated include the donor research system, donor tracking system, management information system, market position analysis, planning and goal-setting, program evaluation, staff evaluation, chief development officer role, chief development officer leadership, close relationship with donors, commitment to excellence, commitment to the institution, entrepreneurial atmosphere, institutional commitment to fund-raising, institutional image defined and well-known, presidential leadership in fund-raising, and trustee participation and support. Results are presented and interpreted. They suggest general agreement on important program aspects, with some differences in perception by institution type. Includes 12 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326103

University of Pittsburgh

VICE PRESIDENT FOR UNIVERSITY RELATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT

TESTING THE CONVENTIONAL WISDOM OF FUND RAISING EFFECTIVENESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Margaret A. Duronio, Ph.D.

and

Bruce A. Loessin

Paper Presented 1990 ASHE Conference

Portland, Oregon

November, 1990

HE 024 003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FIRST FLOOR, LOEFFLER BUILDING, 122 MEYRAN AVENUE, PITTSBURGH, PA 15213 (412) 683-5941

ASHE

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Red Lion-Jantzen Beach in Portland, Oregon, November 1-4, 1990. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

TESTING THE CONVENTIONAL WISDOM OF FUND RAISING EFFECTIVENESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

This paper is a partial report on the third of a series of national studies on fund raising effectiveness in higher education. Although our first study (Duronio & Loessin, 1990; Loessin, Duronio, & Borton, 1988a; Loessin, Duronio, & Borton, 1988b) demonstrated that some institutional characteristics are highly correlated with fund raising outcomes (endowment and total institutional budget, are highly correlated, for instance, but age of institution and size of enrollment are not), these findings are not particularly useful to administrators seeking to improve fund raising programs. Also, this research on quantitative factors did not fully explain why some institutions raise considerably more money in voluntary support than do other institutions with similar institutional resources.

In the second study, we conducted intensive case studies in ten institutions with successful fund raising programs to examine support systems and qualitative factors that might be underlying fund raising performance. (Partial results of this study are available in Loessin & Duronio, 1990.) A book (Duronio & Loessin, 1991) reporting full results of this study will be published by Jossey-Bass in 1991. To identify institutions with successful programs, we used multiple regression analyses to find institutions in which actual dollars raised were higher than statistically predicted. From this pool of about 100 such institutions, we selected one institution from each of ten types. The types were private and public research universities, private and public doctoral universities, private and public comprehensive universities, private and public baccalaureate colleges, and private and public two-year colleges. We collected data by making site visits of one to

four days' duration to each institution and interviewed more than 100 people important to successful fund raising efforts (including presidents, chief development officers, others with managerial responsibility for fund raising, development officers, and other institutional administrators.) We also reviewed relevant documents and materials. To guide the case studies, we developed, from a review of the literature (Gilley, Fulmer, & Reithlingshoefer, 1986; Heeman, 1985; Pickett, 1977; Webb, 1986; and Willmer, 1981), a list of aspects to study from among those the authors believe are associated with fund raising effectiveness. The list, displayed in Table 1, included qualitative characteristics such as presidential leadership and support systems such as donor research. The list reflects both traditional and state-of-the-art practice and is made up of aspects that, unlike basic institutional characteristics, are under the control of, and thereby can be changed and improved by, presidents and chief development officers in any institution with a serious commitment to increasing fund raising outcomes.

Results indicated that many of the aspects from the list were strongly characteristic of the successful fund raising programs studied. In every institution visited, when interviewees were asked to explain their fund raising success, without exception they named one or more aspect from the list. Some aspects were absent in some institutions, and no institution was outstanding in all aspects, indicating that fund raising programs can be successful with many combinations of these aspects. The aspects identified most often as related to fund raising success were those associated with leadership and institutional commitment to fund raising.

The purposes of the third study, upon which this paper is based, are (a) to measure current "conventional wisdom" about the importance of the aspects

on the list; (b) to measure the strengths of these aspects in institutions and fund raising programs with various levels of fund raising success; and (c) to collect information regarding fund raising expenditures and number of staff in individual institutions of various types, with dissimilar institutional characteristics, and various levels of fund raising success. This paper reports results only for the measurement of current conventional wisdom. Other papers reporting full results are forthcoming.

Methodology

Selection of Institutions

The 504 institutions included in this study were selected from all institutions reporting fund raising results to the Council for Aid to Education (CFAE) for each of the three years from 1985/86 through 1987/88. The 504 institutions include all those reporting (in the three consecutive years) of the following types: private and public research universities, private and public doctoral universities, public comprehensive universities, and private and public two-year colleges. Because there are higher total numbers of private comprehensive universities and private baccalaureate colleges which report results each year, 100 of each of these types were selected at random. Because of rapidly declining numbers of such types of institutions, public baccalaureate colleges were eliminated as a type of institution from the current study.

Using data from the CFAE reports (Council for Aid to Education, 1987, 1988, 1989), we performed multiple regression analyses to predict voluntary support results for each institution based on institutional characteristics and fund raising results. Three-year averages were calculated for all institutional characteristics and results to soften the impact of any unusual

one-year events. The ratio of actual and predicted results was used to define high, middle, and low levels of fund raising performance within each type. Roughly, an institution raising about 120% or more of the predicted amount was defined as a high performing institution; an institution raising about 75% or less of the predicted amount was defined as a low performing institution.

Survey Instrument

Without being informed of the level of performance assigned to their institutions, chief development officers were asked to respond to a survey consisting of the items as they are worded in Table 1. The instrument asked for two ratings for each item, one to measure the respondent's belief about the importance of the item to fund raising success and the other to evaluate each aspect in the respondent's institution. In another set of items, the survey also asked for information about fund raising expenditures and staff size; those results will be presented in a forthcoming paper.

Description of Institutions Responding

Of the 504 institutions included in the survey, responses were received from 398, or 79.0%, after the initial survey and two follow-ups. Table 2 shows the number of surveyed and responding institutions in each type. Responding institutions not only include all types but also are very diverse in institutional characteristics and fund raising results. Table 3 shows the ranges by type of institution for seven institutional characteristics, total voluntary support, and gifts from alumni, non-alumni individuals, corporations, and foundations. Total voluntary support for these institutions ranged from $135,321,436 for one private research university to $22,823 for one public two-year college. Endowment ranged from $1,972,522,333 for one

Table 1. List of Aspects Associated with Fund Raising Effectiveness

Support Systems	Donor Research System -- Organized, formal methods to identify prospects.
	Donor Tracking System -- Organized, formal methods to track donors and prospects.
	Management Information System -- Computerized fund raising records, outcomes, and donor information.
	Market Position Analysis -- Organized, formal methods to assess fund raising potential.
	Planning and Goal Setting -- Organized, formal methods to set strategy and tactics and project results.
	Program Evaluation -- Organized, formal methods to assess programs and costs.
	Staff Evaluation -- Organized, formal methods to assess staff performance.
Qualitative Aspects	Chief Development Officer Critical to Institutional Mission -- Chief development officer participates in setting overall institutional goals and has influence with president.
	Chief Development Officer's Leadership -- Chief development officer's impact on staff.
	Close Relationships with Donors -- Emphasis in fund raising approach on effective relationships with donors and regard for donors' best interests.
	Commitment to Excellence -- Fund raising staff committed to continued improvement in all aspects of fund raising process, including dollars raised.
	Commitment to the Institution -- Fund raising staff's regard for institution and investment in institution's overall advancement.
	Entrepreneurial Atmosphere -- Creativity in fund raising; willingness to take risks to explore new opportunities.
	Institutional Commitment to Fund Raising -- Adequate institutional resources committed for meeting fund raising goals; fund raising accepted and appreciated as critical to institution.
	Institutional Image Defined and Well-Known -- Institutional strengths, goals, and needs clearly defined and well-communicated among fund raising staff and all constituencies.
	Presidential Leadership in Fund Raising -- President's articulation of "case" for private gifts; generation of broad consensus for fund raising objectives; participation in direct fund raising.
	Trustee Participation and Support -- Trustees' understanding of fund raising goals and programs; involvement in fund raising as donors, resources, and/or solicitors.

Table 2. Number and Percentage of Responding Institutions by Type

Type of Institution	Total Surveyed	Number Responding	Percentage Responding
Private Research	25	17	68.0
Public Research	23	19	82.6
Private Doctoral	32	22	68.7
Public Doctoral	65	54	83.1
Private Comprehensive	100	76	76.0
Public Comprehensive	92	70	76.1
Private Baccalaureate	100	89	89.0
Private Two-Year	18	15	83.3
Public Two-Year	48	36	75.0
TOTALS	504	398	79.0

Table 3. Range of Fund Raising Results and Institutional Characteristics for Nine Types of Institutions

	Type of Institution	High	Median	Low
Total Voluntary Support	Private Research	$135,321,436	$69,468,321	$3,471,130
	Public Research	$65,916,352	$34,944,779	$6,783,633
	Private Doctoral	$41,058,747	$11,303,562	$1,734,713
	Public Doctoral	$42,643,995	$5,924,712	$1,099,073
	Private Comprehensive	$14,107,964	$2,597,571	$180,803
	Public Comprehensive	$9,844,841	$973,228	$143,793
	Private Baccalaureate	$27,563,509	$2,022,380	$171,915
	Private Two-Year	$1,900,582	$815,091	$158,894
	Public Two-Year	$3,114,541	$250,000	$22,823
Alumni Gifts	Private Research	$53,096,016	$13,073,646	$915,790
	Public Research	$15,333,664	$9,544,806	$669,660
	Private Doctoral	$23,487,897	$2,557,089	$22,718
	Public Doctoral	$17,717,082	$1,418,255	$9,824
	Private Comprehensive	$3,157,805	$686,005	$8,704
	Public Comprehensive	$1,340,718	$154,278	$12,445
	Private Baccalaureate	$8,940,976	$633,724	$1,590
	Private Two-Year	$887,220	$186,579	$19,486
	Public Two-Year	$268,062	$4,079	$0
Non-Alumni Gifts	Private Research	$28,824,387	$12,221,699	$959,608
	Public Research	$14,522,651	$6,817,375	$1,222,428
	Private Doctoral	$22,694,980	$2,401,804	$835,057
	Public Doctoral	$7,619,662	$1,452,237	$206,921
	Private Comprehensive	$10,434,948	$751,340	$43,274
	Public Comprehensive	$3,802,324	$302,347	$12,360
	Private Baccalaureate	$18,901,500	$616,458	$57,723
	Private Two-Year	$979,987	$318,612	$57,978
	Public Two-Year	$667,340	$64,359	$167
Corporation Gifts	Private Research	$41,303,056	$13,333,352	$283,325
	Public Research	$26,580,537	$13,713,873	$1,206,075
	Private Doctoral	$10,091,956	$2,312,524	$208,357
	Public Doctoral	$18,280,930	$2,245,491	$410,705
	Private Comprehensive	$6,718,817	$344,482	$37,158
	Public Comprehensive	$3,950,796	$246,605	$6,703
	Private Baccalaureate	$1,087,676	$232,672	$10,655
	Private Two-Year	$406,597	$109,308	$5,151
	Public Two-Year	$7,000,797	$110,399	$4,840
Foundation Gifts	Private Research	$32,352,624	$14,643,642	$702,393
	Public Research	$17,812,797	$6,137,376	$586,648
	Private Doctoral	$7,554,079	$1,989,503	$79,144
	Public Doctoral	$5,000,558	$962,485	$29,272
	Private Comprehensive	$4,429,525	$359,472	$26,064
	Public Comprehensive	$1,376,487	$73,583	$0
	Private Baccalaureate	$3,306,484	$315,604	$4,767
	Private Two-Year	$725,795	$78,758	$10,319
	Public Two-Year	$1,393,480	$20,000	$0

(continued next page)

(Table 3 continued)

	Type of Institution	High	Median	Low
Endowment	Private Research	$1,972,922,333	$491,283,333	$34,099,560
	Public Research	$463,876,686	$135,216,502	$29,216,859
	Private Doctoral	$784,982,799	$135,264,357	$2,164,112
	Public Doctoral	$1,283,007,699	$23,368,556	$1,082,925
	Private Comprehensive	$213,177,833	$10,404,503	$100,000
	Public Comprehensive	$19,237,023	$2,130,177	$5,669
	Private Baccalaureate	$260,327,667	$7,231,907	$33,842
	Private Two-Year	$7,427,397	$2,987,394	$338,726
	Public Two-Year	$5,352,180	$398,069	$10,000
Educational and General Expenditures	Private Research	$702,079,667	$213,369,000	$34,346,667
	Public Research	$930,128,203	$480,871,663	$120,218,314
	Private Doctoral	$380,019,667	$90,827,871	$27,111,605
	Public Doctoral	$483,982,844	$157,260,457	$47,663,187
	Private Comprehensive	$109,146,043	$15,658,028	$3,012,954
	Public Comprehensive	$172,361,500	$31,366,425	$9,175,244
	Private Baccalaureate	$52,207,719	$8,856,539	$2,439,157
	Private Two-Year	$9,023,244	$3,795,442	$816,148
	Public Two-Year	$133,035,898	$17,452,967	$3,638,068
Expenditures per Student	Private Research	$80,913	$29,757	$9,758
	Public Research	$19,934	$11,179	$7,031
	Private Doctoral	$31,733	$9,860	$4,571
	Public Doctoral	$17,794	$8,497	$3,002
	Private Comprehensive	$10,469	$6,234	$2,216
	Public Comprehensive	$15,797	$4,848	$2,339
	Private Baccalaureate	$26,099	$8,951	$3,208
	Private Two-Year	$11,771	$7,271	$3,618
	Public Two-Year	$5,314	$2,416	$573
Tuition	Private Research	$13,759	$12,466	$5,500
	Public Research	$3,836	$1,921	$1,144
	Private Doctoral	$13,335	$9,701	$6,201
	Public Doctoral	$3,894	$1,925	$833
	Private Comprehensive	$11,968	$7,440	$148
	Public Comprehensive	$2,598	$1,333	$718
	Private Baccalaureate	$15,670	$7,385	$2,648
	Private Two-Year	$7,900	$5,080	$3,200
	Public Two-Year	$1,607	$1,154	$231
Alumni of Record	Private Research	192,071	85,270	16,662
	Public Research	321,658	205,908	72,500
	Private Doctoral	147,063	59,041	13,742
	Public Doctoral	246,142	88,501	13,168
	Private Comprehensive	55,084	15,097	1,519
	Public Comprehensive	98,333	26,141	4,124
	Private Baccalaureate	39,536	9,125	1,566
	Private Two-Year	15,069	9,531	961
	Public Two-Year	54,018	10,839	300

(continued next page)

Table 3 continued

	Type of Institution	High	Median	Low
Enrollment	Private Research	30,754	9,703	1,825
	Public Research	90,187	43,207	17,097
	Private Doctoral	27,548	7,313	3,021
	Public Doctoral	53,347	21,549	6,889
	Private Comprehensive	13,925	2,785	674
	Public Comprehensive	37,870	6,254	1,573
	Private Baccalaureate	3,312	1,169	334
	Private Two-Year	2,411	696	69
	Public Two-Year	48,172	6,547	1,742
Age of Institution	Private Research	287	127	40
	Public Research	222	137	92
	Private Doctoral	219	121	30
	Public Doctoral	295	110	19
	Private Comprehensive	201	101	28
	Public Comprehensive	201	89	17
	Private Baccalaureate	239	121	27
	Private Two-Year	201	88	30
	Public Two-Year	80	27	16

private research university to $5,669 for one public comprehensive university.

Survey Findings

Chief development officers were asked to rate the importance to overall fund raising success of seventeen items according to the following scale: 4, of utmost importance; 3, of great importance; 2, of some importance; and 1, of little or no importance. We examined overall average responses for each respondent, for each item, and for types of institutions, and, also, ranks of items based on average ratings they received in each type of institution.

Overall Responses

Almost 95% of all respondents had overall averages of 3.00 or above for all responses, indicating that in general respondents believe the items are important to fund raising success. More than half (53.6%) of the respondents had overall response averages between 3.25 and 3.74 (see Table 4). There were no important differences between overall averages for surveys completed by respondents at public institutions or by respondents at private institutions.

Average Responses by Items

Table 5 shows average responses for each item for all public and all private institutions and for all institutions combined. Codes for each item used in the following tables and text are as follows:

DRES -- Donor Research System

DTRK -- Donor Tracking System

MIS -- Management Information System

MKT -- Market Position Analysis

PLAN -- Planning and Goal-Setting

PVAL -- Program Evaluation

SVAL -- Staff Evaluation

Table 4. Number, Cumulative Frequency, and Relative Frequency of Average Responses

Range of Averages	N	cf	% of total	rf
4.00	15	15	3.8	3.8
3.75 - 3.99	58	73	14.7	18.6
3.50 - 3.74	109	182	27.7	46.3
3.25 - 3.49	102	284	25.9	72.3
3.00 - 3.24	88	372	22.4	94.6
2.75 - 2.99	15	387	3.8	98.5
2.50 - 2.74	1	388	.2	98.7
2.25 - 2.49	4	392	1.0	99.7
2.99 - 2.24	2	394*	.5	100.0

* Note: four surveys were incomplete and are not included in this table.

Table 5. Average Responses for Each Item

Item	All Insts.	All Private	All Public	Range Across All Types	Overall Importance
DRES	3.47	3.43	3.51	3.65 - 3.25	Great
DTRK	3.49	3.47	3.52	3.59 - 3.27	Great
MIS	3.60	3.58	3.62	3.76 - 3.41	Great +
MKT	2.78	2.72	2.85	2.97 - 2.59	Some +
PLAN	3.46	3.44	3.49	3.60 - 3.37	Great
PVAL	2.99	2.99	3.00	3.14 - 2.77	Some +
SVAL	3.11	3.08	3.15	3.39 - 2.89	Great
CRIT	3.65	3.69	3.60	3.80 - 3.53	Great +
LEAD	3.54	3.54	3.54	3.65 - 3.53	Great +
CLOS	3.75	3.77	3.72	3.84 - 3.53	Great +
EXC	3.61	3.62	3.59	3.67 - 3.56	Great +
COMI	3.61	3.61	3.61	3.73 - 3.41	Great +
ENT	3.05	3.04	3.06	3.20 - 2.92	Great
ICOM	3.67	3.70	3.64	3.78 - 3.53	Great +
IMAG	3.60	3.65	3.54	3.80 - 3.41	Great +
PRES	3.75	3.78	3.72	3.87 - 3.64	Great +
TRUS	3.57	3.70	3.41	3.71 - 3.36	Great +

CRIT -- Chief Development Officer Critical to Institutional Mission

LEAD -- Chief Development Officer's Leadership

CLOS -- Close Relationships with Donors

EXC -- Commitment to Excellence

COMI -- Commitment to Institution

ENT -- Entrepreneurial Atmosphere

ICOM -- Institutional Commitment to Fund Raising

IMAG -- Institutional Image Defined and Well-Known

PRES -- Presidential Leadership

TRUS -- Trustee Participation and Support

Across all institutions, all items but two had overall averages of 3.0 and above. The two with lower overall average ratings were MKT, 2.78, and PVAL, 2.91. In general, overall averages for private and public institutions did not differ appreciably. The largest difference in averages for private and public respondents was for TRUS (all private, 3.70; all public, 3.41).

We also looked at overall item averages in each type of institution. Table 6 shows the items with the highest and lowest overall average for each type of institution. Note that MKT received the lowest average rating in every type of institution. The table also indicates PRES received the highest ratings in four types of institutions, CLOS received the highest ratings in three types of institutions, and, in the other two types, MIS and ICOM received the highest ratings.

Ranking of Items for Types of Institutions

Because most respondents indicated that most of the items were of at least great importance, we ranked overall averages for each item in each type of institution to identify the relative importance of items when compared to

Table 6. Summary of Average Responses by Type of Institution

Type	Highest and Lowest Averages	Note
Private Research	3.82 PRES - 2.71 MKT	a
Public Research	3.82 CLOS - 2.54 MKT	a
Private Doctoral	3.73 CLOS - 2.64 MKT	b
Public Doctoral	3.74 MIS - 2.82 MKT	c
Private Comprehensive	3.78 ICOM - 2.76 MKT	c
Public Comprehensive	3.76 PRES - 2.97 MKT	a
Private Baccalaureate	3.84 CLOS - 2.67 MKT	d
Private Two-Year	3.87 PRES - 2.87 MKT	d
Public Two-Year	3.78 PRES - 2.83 MKT	e

Notes: a All but MKT and PVAL above 3.00

b All but MKT, PVAL, and SVAL above 3.00

c All but MKT and ENT above 3.00

d All but MKT above 3.00

e All but MKT and SVAL above 3.0

each other. Table 7 shows the rank (based on overall averages) of items by type of institution as well as the average rank across all types. A discussion of the ranking of items follows.

DRES. The overall average rank for donor research systems in private and public research and doctoral universities combined is higher than the overall average rank for all other institutions (7 and 12 respectively), indicating that chief development officers in institutions with larger and more sophisticated fund raising programs and constituencies value donor research more than chief development officers in institutions with smaller fund raising programs.

DTRK. With the exception of public two-year institutions, donor tracking systems generally ranked higher in public institutions than in private. This may suggest that chief development officers in public institutions -- which are likely to have newer fund raising programs -- rate donor tracking higher than chief development officers in more established programs.

MIS. Ranked 1 in public doctoral universities and 3 in public comprehensive universities, the average rank for management information systems for all other types is 9.14, lower than the overall average rank of 7.6. Generally, we anticipated that management information systems would rank higher overall or at least overall in institutions with larger fund raising efforts.

MKT. Ranked last, or 17, in every type of institution, this result may be in part a reflection of the terminology used to define this aspect. Market position analysis is probably the least familiar or least common term or concept among the 17 items, and furthermore, the item as written refers to

Table 7. Ranks of Item Averages by Types of Institutions

Item	Pri Res	Pri Doc	Pri Comp	Pri Bacc	Pri 2-Y	Pub Res	Pub Doc	Pub Comp	Pub 2-Y	Average
DRES	9	6	12	13	13	7	6	9	13	9.8
DTRK	10	13	11	11	10	8	9	7	12	10.1
MIS	11	11	6	10	7	10	1	3	9	7.6
MKT	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17.0
PLAN	13	12	13	12	8	9	11	12	10	11.1
PVAL	16	16	15	16	16	16	15	16	14	15.6
SVAL	14	15	14	14	14	14	13	14	16	14.2
CRIT	3	5	5	4	3	2	4	10	7	4.8
LEAD	6	9	9	9	11	12	5	11	8	8.9
CLOS	4	1	3	1	12	1	2	2	4	3.3
EXC	5	8	8	8	6	5	10	5	5	6.7
COMI	12	10	10	3	5	11	8	4	2	7.2
ENT	15	14	16	15	15	15	16	15	15	15.1
ICOM	7	2	1	6	9	3	3	6	6	5.0
IMAG	8	3	7	7	2	6	12	8	3	6.8
PRES	1	4	2	2	1	4	7	1	1	3.4
TRUS	2	7	4	5	4	13	14	13	11	8.1

formal systems as opposed to the intuitive ones all experienced fund raisers use to identify donor markets and solicitation strategies. Nevertheless, the consistent rank of 17 also reflects the reality that market strategies are used intuitively rather than formally and systematically in most institutions.

PLAN. In four types of institutions -- three of them public -- planning and goal-setting ranked in the middle range (6-11), and, the remaining five in the low range (12-17). By a small overall margin, planning and goal-setting appear to be more valued in public institutions (overall average rank, 10.5) than in private institutions (overall average rank, 11.6).

PVAL. The overall average rank for program evaluation is 15.6 with the rank of 16 in six types, and no rank higher than 14. Formal program evaluation, like systematic marketing techniques, is not highly valued by chief development officers.

SVAL. Ranked slightly higher than program evaluation, staff evaluation, with an overall average rank of 14.2, was generally equally less valued in private and public institutions, as well as in larger and smaller institutions.

CRIT. Most chief development officers strongly believe that the aspect related to the critical involvement of the chief development officer in setting institutional goals is of great importance to fund raising success. This aspect ranked in the high range (1-5) for all types of institutions but public comprehensive universities and public two-year colleges.

LEAD. In general, chief development officers across all types of institutions have similar, and fairly modest, beliefs about the relative importance of their own leadership in fund raising success. This aspect ranks 8.9 across all institutions, almost square in the middle on the list of 17

items.

EXC. For four types of institutions, commitment to excellence, which includes improvements in programs and dollars raised in its definition, was ranked in the high range. For all others, it ranked in the middle range. These relatively high rankings seem to reflect chief development officers' strong awareness in all institutions that little can be taken for granted in these times of increased competition in fund raising.

COMI. This is a relatively controversial issue in fund raising: does a fund raiser have to be strongly and personally attached to an institution to be an effective advocate and representative, or is a commitment to professional and personal standards of competence and quality performance sufficient for the institution's fund raising success? The ratings of chief development officers in smaller, less complex types of institutions (private baccalaureate, private two-year, public comprehensive, and public two-year) result in a ranking in the high range for commitment to institution. In all others (with the exception of private research in which this aspect ranked in the low range), this aspect ranked in the middle range. Chief development officers in institutions with larger staffs probably have experienced more growth and more staff turnover in recent years and may have learned that when candidates for new positions have a personal commitment to the institution, it is a bonus, rather than a specific qualification they have the option of requiring. However, these results may also reflect chief development officers' experiences that indicate that personal commitment is, in fact, more important in smaller schools.

ENT. Not highly valued in relation to other aspects, entrepreneurial spirit ranked in the low range for all types of institutions, which is a

surprising finding. The definition includes reference to creativity in fund raising and the willingness to take risks, which are not unfamiliar expressions or concepts to chief development officers.

ICOM. With an overall rank of 5.0, this aspect ranked 1 in private comprehensive universities, 2 in private doctoral, and 3 in public research and doctoral universities.

IMAG. Highly valued in three types, ranked in the middle by five, and ranked low by one, there are widely varying beliefs by chief development officers across types of institutions about the relative importance of an institutional image that is defined and well-known.

PRES. Ranked high in all but public doctoral universities (in which the rank is 7, in the middle range), presidential leadership is ranked 1 or 2 in six of the nine types of institutions, obviously highly valued by most chief development officers.

TRUS. Ranked considerably lower in public (10.3 overall) than in private (4.4 overall), these results reflect the reality of the still different roles trustees generally have in private and public institutions.

Among the 17 items are seven aspects describing support systems and ten qualitative factors. In general, qualitative factors are ranked higher than systems factors. The five aspects valued most highly are CLOS, PRES, CRIT, ICOM, and EXC. The middle range includes the remaining qualitative aspects with the exception of ENT, and also includes MIS and DRES, as the two most highly valued support systems. Among the six items in the lowest range is the remaining qualitative factor, ENT, and the remaining five system aspects. These results indicate that, relatively speaking, chief development officers value qualitative aspects more than systems factors.

Summary and Conclusions

The overall results of this study indicate that chief development officers in all types of institutions believe the list of items represent aspects that are important to fund raising success. PRES received the highest overall average rating at 3.75 and MKT received the lowest overall average rating at 2.78, indicating that chief development officers believe this aspect is of at least some importance. Overall averages for items did not vary appreciably between all private and all public institutions. When items were ranked by averages for each type of institution, some differences in the relative importance of these aspects did appear and seem to reflect the real differences that exist among types of institutions. (One of the papers forthcoming from this study will address the differences among types of institutions that seem to affect fund raising practice and results.) The strongest difference in rankings occurs for TRUS between public and private institutions, reflecting the fact that trustees in these respective types of institutions often have very different roles and came to be members of their boards in very different ways.

Generally, these results confirm what chief development officers already know, but, to our knowledge, not much empirical evidence has been collected before now to test the conventional wisdom about fund raising success as it appears in the literature against what practitioners actually believe and learn from experience. These results, of course, do not provide evidence that there is, in fact, a relationship between these aspects and fund raising success. In another part of this overall study, we collected data to explore the connections between these aspects and fund raising performance. With the results of this overall study, we hope to contribute to the building of an

empirical foundation for fund raising practice to countermand overly simplistic, too-often generalized (across all types of institutions) traditional ideas, and to provide research-based information to drive decisions regarding fund raising program improvement, evaluation, and resource allocation.

References

Council for Aid to Education. (1987). Voluntary Support to Education. Author, New York.

Council for Aid to Education. (1988). Voluntary Support to Education. Author, New York.

Council for Aid to Education. (1989). Voluntary Support to Education. Author, New York.

Duronio, M.A. and Loessin, B. L. (1990). Fund raising outcomes and institutional characteristics in ten types of higher education institutions. The Review of Higher Education, 13:4, 539-556.

Gilley, J.W., Fulmer, K.A., and Reithlingshoefer, S.J. (1986). Searching for academic excellence. American Council on Education and Macmillan, NY.

Heeman, W. (ed.) (1985). Criteria for evaluating advancement programs. Council for Advancement and Support of Education, Wash. DC.

Loessin, B. L., Duronio, M. A., and Borton, G. L. (1988a). Questioning the conventional wisdom. Currents, 14:8, 33-36.

Loessin, B. L., Duronio, M. A., and Borton, G. L. (1988b). Finding peer institutions for fund raising comparisons. Currents, 14:8, 37-42.

Loessin, B. L. and Duronio, M. A. (1990). The role of planning in successful fund raising in ten higher education institutions. Planning for Higher Education, 18:3, 45-56.

Pickett, W.L. (1977). An assessment of the effectiveness of fund raising policies of private undergraduate colleges. Doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Denver.

Webb, C.H. (1986). "Test yourself." In Strategic planning, marketing and public relations, and fund raising in higher education, C.C. Ryans and W.L. Shankin, (eds.). Scarecrow Press, Metuchen, NJ, pp. 182-186.

Willmer, W.K. (1981). The small college advancement program. Council for Advancement and Support of Education, Wash. DC.